

# THE PALESTINE CONFLICT

by

ELIZABETH P. MACCALLUM

*with the aid of the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association*

‘ ‘ ‘

## INTRODUCTION

**D**URING the latter half of August and the first half of September 1929 there took place in Palestine disturbances more violent than any which have occurred in that country since the establishment of the British mandate under the auspices of the League of Nations. Rioting broke out in widely separated districts, accompanied by burning, looting, acts of cruelty and bloodshed. Bands of Moslem Palestinians, often Bedouin nomads, carried out a series of attacks on Jewish groups, who defended themselves vigorously whenever they were able to do so. In at least one case an attack was made by Arabs on British administrative buildings. On August 25 the Acting High Commissioner cabled for reinforcements. For the first time since the reduction of British troops in Palestine several years ago, British regiments, warships, airplanes and tanks were dispatched to Palestine from Egypt and Malta for the preservation of order within the country itself as distinguished from the regions along its frontiers. Refugees poured into Jerusalem and other centers of population from Jewish settlements and colonies, where it was believed that the Arabs intended to carry out plans of wholesale destruction.

Mr. Arthur Henderson stated on September 6 to the Council of the League of Nations that up to August 31 the number of casualties had been as follows: killed—83 Moslems, 4 Christians, 109 Jews; wounded in hospitals—122 Moslems, 10 Christians, 183 Jews. Martial law was not in force, he said; participants in the disturbances were being tried in the ordinary civil courts, although special measures were being taken to provide for the impartiality of the tribunals which would cope with the large number of cases to come up. A British commission of

inquiry had been appointed, representing the Conservative, Liberal and Labour parties, to investigate the disorders and report to the British government. The latter would then be in a position, Mr. Henderson said, to consider along what lines (within the terms of the mandate) the future policy of Palestine should be directed.<sup>1</sup>

The Palestine disorders had a wide repercussion throughout the world, and especially in countries where there exist substantial Moslem or Jewish communities. The Jews of the United States raised over \$1,500,000 for Jewish relief within a month's time. Although an orthodox Jewish group, the *Agudath Israel*, expressed its full confidence in the British government, there existed a tendency among some Zionists to charge the outbreaks to the indifference or partiality of British administrators in Palestine. In late September an insurgent group of Zionists under the leadership of Mr. Jabotinsky opened a campaign in London for a more vigorous fulfillment of the British promise to support the Jewish national home project and to press for the creation of special Jewish defense units in Palestine.<sup>2</sup> Both Jewish and Arab groups in various countries staged demonstrations, and made appeals to governments and to the League of Nations. Modest sums were raised in Arab communities for the relief of Arab Palestinians.

In the following pages no attempt is made to recount the occurrences of the last month and a half in Palestine. The purpose of the study is rather to examine the sources of conflict between Arabs and Jews which have formerly been known to exist and to which the violence of recent weeks has given added point in the minds of all who have an interest in the country's welfare.

1. *New York Times*, September 7, 1929.

2. *The World* (N. Y.), September 27, 1929.

## HISTORICAL REVIEW

Palestine in historic times has passed under the domination of many successive empires—Babylonian, Persian, Roman and others. There have been periods, however, during which the inhabitants of the country have themselves enjoyed political independence. Two such periods are important for our present purposes. The first occurred after the twelve tribes of Israel gave up a nomadic existence (with which they had experimented for only two generations), invaded the fertile regions west of the Jordan in the fifteenth century B.C. and settled down to enjoy an agricultural life, first under a democratic form of government and later under a monarchical system, founded by King Saul and consolidated under his successor, King David. The country, however, subsequently fell prey to the expanding empires of the east. Still later it became part of the Roman Empire. Under the Emperor Hadrian in the second century A.D., Jerusalem was sacked and the surviving Jews were dispersed.

In the seventh century A.D. Palestine and neighboring territories were invaded by Arab followers of the Caliph Omar. The Arab invaders settled down in the country as the Jews had done before them, under the government of their own leaders. For several centuries the Arab Empire flourished under the Caliphs of Damascus and Baghdad. The Arabs were subsequently conquered by the Turks, but they were never ejected from the country they occupied; for thirteen centuries Arabic has thus been the language of the majority of the inhabitants of those territories which are now under French and British mandates in the Near East.<sup>2a</sup>

Under the Ottoman régime, Palestine comprehended the Sanjak of Jerusalem and the Vilayet of Beirut, within the province of Syria. Along with the other districts of Syria it elected members to the imperial

Parliament in Constantinople after the Constitution was granted in 1908. Thus Palestine at that time had only one neighbor from which it was cut off by political boundaries or tariff barriers; that neighbor was Egypt. From other sections of the Ottoman Empire it was not cut off politically, socially or economically.

The Turks found, however, that there were special difficulties connected with the administration of this region, chiefly because of the peculiar interest taken in it by governments of Christian countries. Foreigners established Christian schools and other Christian institutions in the holy land in much greater numbers than elsewhere in the Near East; governments of the countries from which such foreigners came were concerned for the welfare of the institutions maintained by their nationals. European governments were also vigilant to see that the recognized right of native Christians to worship freely was not tampered with by the Turkish authorities. This gave rise to frequent embarrassment when quarrels broke out between Christian sects over their right of access to Christian shrines or over the right of maintaining them; the quarrels often could not be settled without the intervention of Turkish civil authorities, who found it extraordinarily difficult to please all parties concerned.

But it was not only the Christians of East and West who were bound by ties of sentiment to Palestine as the birthplace of their religion. To Jews the land was equally sacred. In the case of the Jews, however, there existed an additional sentimental bond by reason of the fact that their own ancestors had occupied the country for centuries before their dispersion. Among the fourteen millions of Jews scattered throughout the entire world, there were many who still dreamed, even in Ottoman days, of the revival of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. A group calling itself the Society of Lovers of Zion (*Choveve Zion*) established five small settlements in Palestine before 1883. None of these were originally very successful, however, owing in large part to the inexperience of the enthusiasts who embarked

2a. Syria and Greater Lebanon, directly north of Palestine, are under French mandate. Iraq, originally included among the territories for which mandates were planned, is in treaty relationship with Great Britain and strictly speaking is not under mandate. Great Britain makes annual reports on the administration of Iraq to the League of Nations, however. Palestine and Transjordan are administered under the terms of a single mandate, although Transjordan is exempted from all provisions relating to the Jewish national home.

on the venture. But Baron Edmond de Rothschild came to their rescue with generous subventions, founded two additional colonies and provided permanent assistance for them through the Jewish Colonization Association—later the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association.

#### EARLY YEARS OF ZIONISM

Publication of Theodor Herzl's treatise on "The Jewish State" in 1896 led to the foundation of a Zionist Organization in the following year whose avowed purpose it was to create for the Jewish people "a home in Palestine secured by public law." The first Zionist colony was established in 1908. Although the Ottoman government did not welcome the deliberate enlargement within its dominions of one of the existing minority groups by an organization whose political aims were suspected, it did allow the establishment of a Palestine Zionist Office at Jaffa, and the creation from time to time of new colonies by the Zionist Organization. By 1914 there were five of these, in addition to thirty-eight Jewish colonies founded under other auspices. Thus, at the outbreak of the war the population of the Jewish agricultural settlements was 13,000 out of a total Jewish population estimated by the Zionist Organization to be about 84,000.

The war hindered the work of the Zionist Organization in more than one way. It not only brought campaigning armies into Palestine, with consequent devastation of a number of areas, but it also resulted in cutting off leading Zionists in Central Europe from their former colleagues in Allied countries. Zionist activity did not cease, however. Although immediate promotion of colonial settlement had to be suspended, three Jewish battalions were raised to aid the British forces, two of them being composed of Jews who enlisted in the various Allied countries, and the third being made up of Jews from Palestine itself.<sup>2b</sup>

#### BRITISH UNDERTAKINGS IN THE NEAR EAST

British troops in the Near Eastern campaign during the World War found them-

selves confronted by a difficult military situation, owing to the strategic position of the Turks in Mesopotamia, Syria and Arabia. Knowing that the Arabic-speaking peoples had always been restive under Turkish domination and that under the "Turkification" policy of the Committee of Union and Progress they had grown even more rebellious since 1908, the British government, through Sir Henry MacMahon, entered into correspondence with the Sherif of Mecca in 1915 in the hope that he might be persuaded to revolt against the Turks. The Sherif agreed to aid the British cause in return for a promise that Great Britain would recognize and support the independence of the Arabs within specified areas south of the prospective Turkish boundary. Arabs have maintained that Palestine was included in the specified area; the British, on the contrary, have denied that this was the case. The dispute has hinged upon the terminology of a published letter written by Sir Henry MacMahon to the Sherif Hussein, which has been interpreted in opposite senses.<sup>3</sup> Not all the correspondence with the Sherif Hussein has yet been published by the British government, however.<sup>4</sup> It is affirmed by a writer to whom Hussein showed Sir Henry MacMahon's letters that when the Arab leader flatly refused to accept the territorial reservations proposed by the British authorities, the latter finally conceded the point and in January 1916 definitely undertook to support Arab claims in the whole territory south of the Turkish boundary, except in the protectorate of Aden and in the region of Basra in southern Iraq. In March 1916, as this writer affirms, Sir Henry MacMahon wrote again to the Sherif confirming the agreement.<sup>5</sup> This was the first of an interesting series of agreements with respect to the Near East—a series vitally affecting Arab, British, French and Jewish interests in that region of the world.

In May 1916 Great Britain entered into a secret agreement with France (known as

3. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Correspondence with the Palestine-Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organization, 1922*. Cmd. 1700, p. 20, 26; H. W. V. Temperley, *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. VI, p. 126.

4. J. de V. Loder, *The Truth About Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria*, p. 19. Requests for the publication of the correspondence have been made both in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons.

5. A. Rihani, *Around the Coasts of Arabia*, Part I, Chapter IX. (To appear in December 1929.)

2b. For a fuller account see *Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission, 1928*, on which the above résumé is based.

the Sykes-Picot agreement), which provided for the division of the land-bridge between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf into five distinct regions. Part of this area was to be under direct British control, part under direct French control; part was to be a British sphere of influence, part a French sphere of influence. Palestine, however, was to fall in none of these four categories. "With a view to securing the religious interests of the Entente Powers," the agreement read, "Palestine, with the holy places, is separated from Turkish territory and subjected to a special régime to be determined by agreement between Russia, France and England."<sup>6</sup>

#### BRITISH PROMISES TO THE JEWS

In the following year yet another document appeared which had an important bearing upon the future of Palestine. Throughout 1917 prominent British Zionists under the leadership of Dr. Chaim Weizmann carried on negotiations with the British government with a view to establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine.<sup>7</sup> With the support of prominent Zionists in the United States and with the active assistance of President Wilson, these negotiations resulted in the issuing of the so-called Balfour declaration in London on November 2, 1917. The declaration took the form of a letter from Lord Balfour to Lord Rothschild in the following terms:

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish commu-

nities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."<sup>8</sup>

On February 9, 1918 the French government announced its endorsement of this policy, while in May 1918 the Italian Ambassador to England made a similar announcement on behalf of the Italian government. A letter from President Wilson in support of the Balfour declaration was published in August 1918. The United States Congress in the 1922 session also adopted a joint resolution endorsing it.

Just before the Armistice in 1918, to set at rest any doubts which the Arabs might entertain as to the benevolence of their allies' intentions, the British and French

governments issued a joint declaration on November 7, 1918, which was expected to insure the continued cooperation of the Arabic-speaking peoples of the Near East with the occupying forces.

"The end aimed at by France and Great Britain, in their carrying out of the war in the East unloosed by German ambition, is the complete and

final enfranchisement of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of national governments and administrations, drawing their authority from the initiative and free choice of the native populations.

"To fulfil these purposes, France and Great Britain have agreed to encourage and help the establishment of native governments and administrations in Syria and Mesopotamia, which have been freed by the Allies, and in the territories whose liberation they are now pursuing, and to recognize these as soon as they are effectively established. Far from wishing to impose upon the populations of these regions any particular institutions, the Allies have no other desire than to assure, by their support and by an effective assistance, the normal functioning of the governments and administrations which the populations have freely given themselves. To assure an impartial and equal justice for all, to facilitate the economic development of the country by help-



SKETCH MAP TO ILLUSTRATE THE SYKES-PICOT AGREEMENT

6. H. W. V. Temperley, *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. VI, p. 16.

7. British interest in the Jews had previously been demonstrated by the offer to establish a Jewish national home in Uganda in East Africa; this offer the Zionists had refused.

8. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925*, p. 24.



ing and encouraging local initiative, to favour the spread of education, to bring to an end Turkish political divisions, too long exploited, such is the rôle which the two Allied Governments assume in the liberated territories."<sup>9</sup>

The joint Anglo-French declaration had the desired effect on the minds of Arabs in the Near East. Posted as it was throughout Palestine, as well as in Syria and Mesopotamia, the assumption of the political-minded among the Arabs was that the promise applied to all of pre-war Syria—i. e., to Palestine as well as the regions north and east of it.

Early in 1919 there also gained currency in Palestine the twelfth of President Wilson's Fourteen Points to the effect that nationalities under Turkish rule "should be assured an undoubted security of life and an unmolested opportunity of autonomous development."<sup>10</sup> The principle of self-determination was supposed to be inherent in this doctrine by the Arab speakers and writers of the day in Palestine. It was widely quoted. At the same time Palestinian Arabs were aware of the public undertakings which Great Britain had made to the Jews in the Balfour declaration in November 1917.

#### THE NEAR EAST SETTLEMENT

Changes were introduced in the Sykes-Picot agreement after the publication of the Anglo-French declaration which closely affected the interests both of Arabs and of Jews. M. Clemenceau asked in December 1918 that Palestine, instead of being placed under an international régime, should be awarded to France. The British government, which had taken the initiative a year earlier in supporting the Zionist project for a Jewish national home in Palestine, refused to relinquish its leadership now to the French government. M. Clemenceau subsequently had to agree that Great Britain should assume the administration of Palestine, although (in spite of the unwelcome expense involved) he would have preferred to see the original plan for international control carried out.<sup>11</sup>

At the Peace Conference in 1919 still another decision affecting the Near East was reached. Article 22 of the League Covenant—the article providing for the establishment of the mandate system—proclaimed that in colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war had ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which were inhabited by peoples not yet ready to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that "the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization." In the same article it was stated that certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire had reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations could be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they were able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities were to be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory.

President Wilson was resolved that the wishes of the inhabitants should be consulted and proposed that an international commission should conduct an inquiry on the spot. France refused to cooperate, however, and Great Britain followed the lead of France. In May 1919 a purely American commission went to the Near East, reporting that the United States was given first choice in 60.5 per cent and Great Britain in 3.75 per cent of the petitions it received. In 57.49 per cent of the petitions Great Britain was given second choice. The commission also reported that there was general agreement in favor of retaining the unity of Syria and Palestine, as well as a strong sentiment against France as mandatory for Syria. At a meeting of the Supreme Council on March 20, 1919, however, the British and French representatives had already made clear what the intentions of their governments were with respect to the division of the territory.<sup>12</sup> These plans were

9. J. de V. Loder, *The Truth About Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria*, p. 32.

10. H. W. V. Temperley, *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. I, p. 434.

11. *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 142.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 145. The American Commission of Inquiry reported also that only 0.99 per cent of its petitioners in the Near East supported the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, while 72.3 per cent expressed opposition to it. This report has been published unofficially in *Editor and Publisher* for December 2, 1922.

carried out without reference to the findings of the American commission.

Just thirteen months later, the Supreme Allied Council, at its meeting in San Remo on April 24, 1920, awarded the mandate for Syria and the Lebanon to France, and the mandates for Palestine and Iraq to Great Britain. On July 1, 1920 the military administration of Palestine was converted to a civil one under the first British High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel. The British government drafted a list of principles to govern the Palestine administration; this draft "mandate" was approved by the Council of the League of Nations on July 24, 1922, although for technical reasons it did not enter formally into effect until September 29, 1923.

On June 21, 1922 the British House of Lords passed a resolution expressing its dissatisfaction with the terms of the mandate.<sup>13</sup> The British government has never submitted the mandate to Parliament inasmuch as it is not a formal treaty. Its policy has been endorsed in effect, however, when the Middle East estimates have been adopted by Parliament year by year. Successive British governments have also reaffirmed their support of the Balfour declaration.

#### TERMS OF THE PALESTINE MANDATE

In the mandate for Palestine the seal of wide international approval was set to the principle of the Balfour declaration on the one hand and to the application of the mandate system to Palestine on the other. In the preamble reference is made to the decision of the principal Allied powers to entrust the administration of the country to a mandatory for the purpose of giving effect to Article 22 of the Covenant. Reference is also made to their decision to carry out the full terms of the Balfour declaration, giving recognition to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country. Accordingly, after providing that the mandatory should have full powers of legislation and administration in the country (save as they might be

limited by the terms of the mandate) the document went on to provide for carrying out the Jewish national home policy on the one hand and for guaranteeing the rights of the existing population on the other.

In Article 2 the mandatory made itself responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as would secure the establishment of the Jewish national home; it undertook to be responsible for the development of self-governing institutions, too, as well as for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion. In Article 4 provision was made for special advice to be given the Palestine administration by a so-called Jewish Agency.<sup>13a</sup> Under Article 6 the British government undertook that the Palestine administration should facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and encourage close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes. In this work the administration was to have the aid of the official Jewish Agency. The rights and position of other sections of the population were not to be prejudiced.

The mandatory assumed all responsibility with respect to the holy places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including the preservation of existing rights, and securing free access to shrines. The fabric and management of purely Moslem shrines would not be interfered with. A special commission was to be appointed by the mandatory to study, define and determine rights and claims in connection with holy places and religious communities.

The Palestine mandate provided also that the mandatory was to guarantee the territorial integrity of the country; that local autonomy was to be encouraged; that natives and foreigners were to have their rights pro-

13a. "Article 4. An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

"The Zionist organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home."

13. *Current History*, September 1922, p. 1008.

tected by an adequate judicial system; that the control of foreign policy was to be in the hands of the mandatory power; that there was to be no economic discrimination against the nationals of any State Member of the League of Nations; that archaeo-

logical enterprises were to be safeguarded and properly regulated; that inhabitants were to enjoy liberty of conscience and freedom of worship, and that the various communities were to enjoy the right to maintain separate educational institutions.

## THE ORGANIZATION OF JEWS AND ARABS

At the time when the mandate was approved by the League Council, Palestine had a population of 757,182, of whom 590,890 were Moslems, 73,024 Christians and 83,794 Jews. The remaining 9,474 were principally Druzes.<sup>14</sup> The Jews were divided roughly into three groups—those who had come in under Zionist auspices, those who had come in during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries under non-Zionist Jewish auspices (such as the immigrants assisted by the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association already referred to) and the descendants of those who had returned to Palestine in earlier periods—as in the fifteenth century, when Jews were expelled from Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella.<sup>15</sup>

The non-Jews, popularly although inaccurately called Arabs, were divided between pure Arabs and those who had an admixture of Arab blood, but who were descended from pre-Arab inhabitants of the country. The latter formed the bulk of the settled urban and agricultural population of Palestine, but the majority of the pure Arabs were nomad tribesmen, of whom there were estimated to be 103,000 in 1922.<sup>16</sup>

### THE JEWISH AGENCY

As has already been indicated, not all Jews in Palestine were Zionists at the close of the World War. But when the mandate recognized the Zionist Organization as a Jewish Agency with special public functions in Palestine, it did so because Zionists were

thoroughly organized both in Palestine and abroad and were actively interested in the success of the unique experiment announced in the Balfour declaration. Forming a world organization, they had established Zionist federations in many different countries. General policies were determined in the biennial congresses of the World Zionist Organization and carried out by an elected Zionist Executive assisted by a General Council. The World Zionist Congresses represented not only all the territorial federations but also certain special unions, organized on a non-territorial basis, which had special programs in view not endorsed by the main body of Zionists.<sup>17</sup> The Zionist Executive was in a position to keep in touch with affairs in Palestine through those of its members who resided in the country and could also enjoy contact with the great body of Zionists through those members of the Zionist Executive who resided in other countries having large Zionist federations.<sup>18</sup>

### PRACTICAL WORK OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

To make its activities the more effective the World Zionist Organization has delegated a considerable part of its practical work to certain corporations and companies. The main financial institutions of the Zionist Organization are now five in number. The first and second are the Jewish Colonial

14. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925*, p. 48.

15. A fourth group, negligible in numbers, was made up of descendants of Jews who had never left Palestine at all.

16. In this report, as in British official documents, the word "Arab" is used in the wider sense to include the majority of non-Jews in Palestine and not Bedouin tribesmen only.

17. Such special unions now include the Order of Ancient Maccabees, an English fraternal order; the *Mizrachi* Zionists, or orthodox religious Jews; and two (formerly three) labor groups, known as *Poale Zion* and *Hitachduth* respectively—the former being the Jewish Socialist Labor Confederation and the latter a more moderate labor group.

18. Today there are seven members of the Zionist Executive in Palestine (four general Zionists, two laborites and one *Mizrachi* Zionist). Their duty is to watch over the work of the Zionist Organization in Palestine, and to keep in close touch both with the Palestine administration and with their own colleagues abroad. Of the latter there are three in England, one in Germany and one in the United States. There are at present 47 territorial Zionist federations and a few smaller Zionist societies included in the World Zionist Organization in addition to the special unions already listed.

Trust, Ltd., and its subsidiary, the Anglo-Palestine Company, Ltd., both of which provide banking facilities in Palestine. Each had a balance sheet of over \$10,000,000 for the year 1928.

The third financial institution of the Zionist Organization is the Jewish National Fund, which by 1929 acquired on behalf of the Jews a total of almost 250,000 *dunums* of rural land (about 71,500 acres) and 1,600 *dunums* (over 450 acres) of urban land. The Jewish National Fund makes itself responsible for general improvements of the land it acquires, by promoting afforestation work, draining swamps, furnishing communities with safe supplies of drinking-water and providing other necessities and amenities. The receipts of the fund between 1924 and 1928 averaged \$1,384,000 annually.

The fourth Zionist financial institution is the Palestine Land Development Company, Ltd., which since the war has acquired 134,319 *dunums* (about 38,400 acres) of land for plantations. In the last three years this company has sold to Jews 50,000 *dunums* (about 14,300 acres) of its land. Its trial balance sheet in December 1928 showed a balance of over \$2,100,000.

#### THE PALESTINE FOUNDATION FUND

The fifth financial institution of the Zionist Organization is the Palestine Foundation Fund, Ltd., or *Keren Hayesod* as it is known in Hebrew. This was established to unite all Jewish forces willing to assist in upbuilding the Jewish national home. It received for Zionist projects during the eight years from 1921-1929 a total of approximately \$18,000,000, to be expended in commercial and philanthropic ventures of many varieties. Through the Palestine Foundation Fund, the Zionist Organization maintains a complex variety of services for the reception, settlement and subsequent welfare of Jewish immigrants to Palestine. It conducts training centers in Europe for prospective agricultural workers and aids in the establishment of needy immigrants by providing loans for initial equipment. It pays head taxes for Jewish immigrants of the laboring class who have no capital. It gives financial

assistance to colonies that are not self-supporting, provides agricultural demonstrations and advice, conducts agricultural, commercial and industrial research, encourages cooperative institutions of many kinds, cares for the Jewish unemployed, and arranges for loans to individuals and societies. It maintains a complete educational system.<sup>19</sup>

The Women's International Zionist Organization (British and European) through the Palestine Foundation Fund supports a school of domestic science, an agricultural school for girls, a girls' training farm and urban community welfare work.<sup>20</sup>

Medical and welfare work is carried on through the Palestine Foundation Fund by *Hadassah*, the Women's Zionist Organization of Canada and the United States, as their particular contribution to the reconstruction of Palestine. The *Hadassah* Medical Organization maintains four hospitals (with a total of 367 beds), polyclinics in five cities, bacteriological laboratories, rural health services and sixteen health welfare centers, beside a completely equipped Health Center in Jerusalem, a school for nurses and courses for physicians. It provides remedial and prophylactic work for children in Jewish schools and has carried on effective campaigns against trachoma, malaria, typhoid and other epidemic and endemic diseases. Its medical welfare services have been provided primarily for Jews, but have been used widely by non-Jews as well.

A Sick Benefit Fund has also been organized under Zionist auspices. With a membership of almost 15,000, this fund provides medical aid for the new settlements and some of the older colonies. It maintains one hospital, three nursing homes, two convalescent homes and various other health services.<sup>21</sup>

19. Zionist schools, aided schools and schools merely under the educational supervision of the Palestine Zionist Executive totalled 225 in the school year 1927-1928, and had an attendance of 18,680. Of these 114 were kindergartens, 97 elementary, 6 secondary, 4 normal schools and 4 technical and music schools (cf. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan, 1928*, p. 48). At Haifa a Technical Institute has been maintained, with departments of engineering and architecture, while the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the highest institution of learning supported in Palestine by Jews, provides facilities for research along various lines and has begun to offer lecture courses (cf. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 278, 283).

20. *Ibid.*, p. 377.

21. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 266-310.



## ENLARGING THE JEWISH AGENCY

Such, in brief outline, are the organs established by Zionists for realizing their aim. On these general and specific services toward the reconstruction of Palestine the Zionist Organization is said by the mandatory power to have spent some seven million pounds (almost \$34,000,000) since the Balfour declaration was issued.<sup>22</sup> Baron Edmond de Rothschild is reported to have spent an additional \$50,000,000 on the colonies now supervised by the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association.<sup>23</sup> A number of smaller enterprises have secured the investment of further sums in the development of the country.

Of the fifteen million Jews in the world today 1,200,000 are enrolled as members of the Zionist Organization. But Article 4 of the mandate for Palestine provided that the Zionist Organization, recognized as the official Jewish Agency, should take steps to secure the cooperation of all Jews willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home. Such action was naturally to the advantage of the Zionist Organization, which was desirous of broadening its base of support. Prolonged negotiations therefore took place between Zionists and non-Zionist Jews<sup>23a</sup> on the subject of cooperation in Palestine. They were brought to a successful close in August 1929, when a basis of agreement was arrived at between Zionists and many of those Jews who were unwilling for one reason or another to subscribe either to the political doctrines or the entire program of Zionism. The Council of the Jewish Agency is now enlarged so as to consist of an equal number of Zionists and

non-Zionists.<sup>24</sup> An Executive Committee of the Council of the Jewish Agency, consisting of twenty Zionists and twenty non-Zionists, is henceforth to bear the chief burden of the duties described in Article 4 of the mandate which have hitherto devolved upon the Zionist Executive.

## LOCAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

The Jewish community in Palestine itself is organized for both secular and religious purposes. In 1920 a Jewish National Assembly was elected by the Jews of Palestine; this group in turn appointed a National Council, known as the *Vaad Leumi*, which has represented the views of the local Jewish community as a whole in secular matters. The latter body has kept in touch with its constituency on the one hand and the Palestine government on the other; it has also submitted petitions to the League of Nations on behalf of the Palestine Jewish community.

Furthermore, a Labor Organization has existed, which in 1926 included 22,460 members or 70 per cent of the Jewish workers in the country.<sup>25</sup>

A Rabbinical Council and a Rabbinical Assembly were recognized by the government as having authority in religious matters. Rabbinical courts have jurisdiction in certain cases affecting the personal status of Jews. A religious communities organization ordinance has been put into effect, which enables the people of any considerable religious group to organize for the purpose of carrying on certain community projects. The Jewish community is in process of organizing in two such groups, one of which represents the orthodox Jewish community.

22. *Report of the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan, 1928*, p. 117.

23. *Reports of the Experts submitted to the Joint Palestine Survey Commission, 1928*, p. 34.

23a. A distinction is to be drawn between non-Zionists and anti-Zionist Jews. The number of non-Zionists is considerable, while the number of anti-Zionist Jews is said by Zionists to be negligible. Non-Zionist Jews are those mainly who believe the destiny of the Jews to be an international one. Their efforts are directed toward consolidating the position and developing the influence of Jews in the various countries in which they find themselves, rather than toward the creation of a predominantly Jewish State in any part of the world.

24. The latter represent general Jewish organizations in nineteen countries. The basis of agreement between Zionists and non-Zionists was not reached until after an extensive survey of Palestine reconstruction work had been completed by disinterested experts in 1927. The findings of these experts were submitted to a Joint Survey Commission of distinguished Zionists and non-Zionists who in the following year drew up a series of recommendations urging the substitution of business methods for philanthropy as the only practical method of colonization in Palestine. The report of the Joint Survey Commission, to which frequent reference is made in the present study, is one of the most valuable handbooks in existence on the subject of present-day Jewish effort in Palestine.

25. L. Stein, "The Development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine," in A. J. Toynbee, *Survey of International Affairs, 1925*, Vol. I, p. 373.

## ARAB ORGANIZATIONS

The foregoing is a formal outline of the complex organization which has developed among the Jews within Palestine and without. The organization of the Arabs is simpler. A Supreme Moslem Council, formed by the Moslem Arabs in 1921 at the request of the British authorities, has control over Moslem pious foundations. Under the religious communities ordinance both Moslem and Christian Arab communities have the right to organize as the Jewish community is doing. For secular purposes there is no organization embrac-

ing the majority of the Arab population. Soon after British control was established, many of the Moslems and Christians in Palestine united, however, in an Arab Congress to combat the fulfillment of the Balfour declaration and the terms of the mandate. In course of time a National party, more moderate than the Arab Congress, came into existence, diminishing somewhat the membership of the older organization. A Syro-Palestinian Congress, with headquarters in Egypt, made itself responsible, meanwhile, for presenting the claims of Arab nationalism to public opinion generally and to the League of Nations in particular.

## THE POLITICAL CONFLICT

Prior to the British occupation, Jews and Arabs in Palestine lived together in tranquillity. Since the British occupation, however, there have been four serious outbreaks of which the first three occurred in 1920 and 1921. Total casualties reported among Jews and Arabs were 104 killed and over 400 wounded on these earlier occasions. Zionists have ascribed these outbreaks to agitation carried on by members of the *effendi* class—i. e., the educated and the land-owning minority. A British commission of inquiry which went to Palestine in 1921 to investigate the Jaffa riots of that year, however, placed emphasis upon certain social, economic and political conflicts which they believed had entered into the situation. It is upon such social, economic and political conflicts that the Arab leaders have also placed emphasis in their communications with British authorities and their petitions to the League of Nations.

Political conflicts in Palestine have had to do with that clause of Article 2 of the mandate which foreshadowed the creation of self-governing institutions in the country. In the early period from 1920 until 1922 no legislature existed. Instead, a nominated Advisory Council aided the British administration by offering criticism of prospective legislative measures. The Advisory Council consisted of ten British officials, four Moslem Arabs, three Chris-

tian Arabs and three Jews. Sir Herbert Samuel attempted in 1922 to introduce a constitution which would have substituted a Legislative Council for the existing Advisory Council. The proposed body, somewhat like its predecessor, was to be divided between ten official and twelve non-official members. The non-official members were to be elected and were to include eight Moslems, two Christians and two Jews.<sup>26</sup>

The Palestine Zionist Executive favored the High Commissioner's proposal. The Executive of the Palestine Arab Congress, however, opposed it. In the first place, the draft constitution was based on the Balfour declaration, which the Arabs refused to accept.<sup>26a</sup> In the second place, as long as there were official members on the Legislative Council Arabs feared they might

26. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925*, p. 44 ff.

26a. Hussein, Sherif of Mecca, when first notified of the Balfour declaration, accepted it philosophically. His son Feisal at the Peace Conference went farther. He wrote a letter to Mr. Felix Frankfurter in which he noted a similarity between Arab and Jewish aims. Both were national, neither was imperialist. Neither, he thought, could be a real success without the other. His deputation would do its best, he said, to help forward the proposals of the Zionists at the Peace Conference. And it would wish the Jews "a most hearty welcome home." He was afraid misrepresentations had been made to both Arab and Jewish peasantry in Palestine, with the result that interested parties had been able to make capital out of what they called differences between Arabs and Jews. Feisal stated that he believed such differences to be matters of detail and not of principle.

This letter was not followed by further communications in a similar vein from responsible Arab authorities, however.

combine with the Jewish representatives to outvote the Arabs in matters considered vital by the latter. Again, the Arabs believed that the High Commissioner's powers under the constitution would be excessive, having the effect of relegating Palestine to the position of an ordinary colony, in contravention of Article 22 of the Covenant.

#### ARAB OPPOSITION TO BALFOUR DECLARATION

The specific objections raised by Arabs against the Balfour declaration itself were numerous but may be summarized as follows:

1. The purpose of Article 22 of the League Covenant was to promote "the well-being and development of the people" of the mandated territories. Alien Jews, living outside of Palestine, did not come within the scope of this aim.

2. The Balfour declaration was preventing Palestine from creating those self-governing institutions which were its right under the terms of Article 2 of the mandate. A communication from the Colonial Office to the Arabs had put the case frankly. "There is no question," it had said, "of treating the people of Palestine as less advanced than their neighbours in Iraq and Syria; the position is that His Majesty's Government are bound (in the case of Palestine) by a pledge which is antecedent to the Covenant of the League of Nations, and they cannot allow a constitutional position to develop in a country for which they have accepted responsibility to the Principal Allied Powers, which may make it impracticable to carry into effect a solemn undertaking given by themselves and their Allies.... It is quite clear that the creation at this stage of a national government would preclude the fulfilment of the pledge made by the British Government to the Jewish people."<sup>27</sup>

3. Article 20 of the League Covenant provided that all States Members of the League must take immediate steps to procure their release from any previous undertakings inconsistent with the terms of the League Covenant. The Arabs demanded the abrogation of the Balfour declaration, because they asserted that it fell in this category.

4. The Jewish national home policy made inevitable the division of the single country of Syria into smaller parts with unnatural bound-

daries, tariffs, high taxation and "all the other inconveniences such segregation entails."<sup>28</sup>

5. By permitting Jewish immigration into Palestine and by attempting immediately to carry out Zionist policies in Palestine the British authorities were violating Article 3 of the Hague Convention, which states that a power occupying a country shall, as far as possible, carry out the laws and regulations of the preceding government and shall effect no vital change until the final status of the occupied country has been regularized.

6. Because of the Balfour declaration the British authorities had set up in Palestine a Jewish Agency whose function it was to advance Jewish interests above all others; this Agency was accused by the Arabs of constant interference in the Palestine administration. To recognize the Zionist Organization as a public body with such wide powers was "totally illegal." Jews should be represented in a Palestinian legislature only in proportion to their numbers. The Jewish Agency constituted an *imperium in imperio* and should be abolished.

#### COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION RETAINED IN PALESTINE

Sir Herbert Samuel refused to acquiesce in the Arab demands for a representative assembly based on the above arguments. He explained his policy later to the Permanent Mandates Commission in the following manner:

"If a standing majority on the Council were created who were opposed to certain terms of the mandate, the government of Palestine would have been placed in a permanent *impasse*, for, on the one hand, it would be obliged to carry out certain measures under the terms of the mandate and, on the other, a hostile majority in the Council would have opposed any attempt to execute those measures."<sup>29</sup>

The Palestine Arab Congress boycotted the elections to the Legislative Council, with the result that Sir Herbert Samuel had to abandon the proposed constitution. Feeling had so risen among the Arab population that he even failed to re-establish an Advisory Council of the sort which had existed before the election. When he attempted to do so, Arab nationalists forced the resignation of such Arabs as he ap-

27. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Correspondence with the Palestine-Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organization, 1922*, (Cmd. 1700) p. 5-6.

28. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifth Session, 1924*, p. 167.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

pointed to the body. In 1923 he fell back on a final expedient. He offered to establish an Arab Agency with functions similar to those of the Jewish Agency. This suggestion, too, the Arabs rejected, maintaining their former position that it was impossible for them, in self defense, to accept anything less than an elected Legislative Assembly and an Executive responsible to it.<sup>30</sup>

Since that time the government of Palestine has been carried on directly by the British administration. Legislation is effected by the High Commissioner in consultation with his subordinates. Draft ordinances are published in the *Official Gazette* some time in advance of promulgation. These may be commented upon by interested groups or individuals, the suggestions being taken into consideration by the British authorities if they are deemed applicable. The Council of the Jewish Agency has the right to discuss with the administration the effects which proposed legislation may be expected to have on Jewish interests.

In 1928 and 1929 Arab delegations several times petitioned the High Commissioner, Sir John Chancellor, for the establishment of an elected Parliament. Sir John Chancellor promised to take the matter up with the Colonial Office but stated that the international obligations of the mandatory and the importance of Palestine to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world as the home and birthplace of three great religions made it difficult to grant the democratic institutions they desired.<sup>31</sup> Meantime, under the leadership of Mr. Josiah Wedgwood, there was founded in England a Seventh Dominion League for the avowed purpose of converting Palestine into a self-governing dominion within the British Empire upon the expiry of the mandate. Arabs held that this project conflicted with the provisions of the League Covenant.

## INTERPRETING THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

Sir Herbert Samuel came early to believe that part of the Arab opposition to the Balfour declaration was based on a misunderstanding of its implications. He knew that the Arabs had accepted rumors to the effect that their land was about to be expropriated for purposes of Jewish colonization and that Palestine was to be subjected to a veritable flood of Jewish immigration until its population had become overwhelmingly Jewish. He knew also that certain Zionists had spoken and written of "making Palestine as Jewish as England was English," and of establishing not an equality of partnership between Jew and Arab, but Jewish predominance.

To discourage exaggerated fears and exaggerated expectations, the High Commissioner arranged in 1922 that the Colonial Office should issue a statement of British policy in Palestine in the form of a more precise interpretation of the Balfour declaration. The following extract from this second declaration indicates the points he considered it necessary to stress:

"Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine.....His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated.....the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language or culture in Palestine.....The terms of the Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home but that such a Home should be founded in Palestine....."

"During the last two or three generations the Jews have recreated in Palestine a community, now numbering 80,000, of whom about one-fourth are farmers or workers upon the land. This community has its own political organs, an elected assembly for the direction of its domestic concerns, elected councils in the towns, and an organisation for the control of its schools. It has its elected Chief Rabbinate and Rabbinical Council for the direction of its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in Hebrew as a vernacular language, and a Hebrew press serves its needs. It has its distinctive intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This community, then, with its town and country population, its political, religious and social

30. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925*, p. 44-46.

31. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifteenth Session, 1929*, p. 79.



organisations, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has in fact 'national' characteristics. When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish National Home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognised to rest upon ancient historic connection."

In subsequent sentences it was added:

"For the fulfilment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish Community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration. This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals. It is essential to ensure that the immigrants should not be a burden upon the people of Palestine as a whole, and that they should not deprive any section of the present population of their employment."<sup>32</sup>

#### RESULTS OF THE INTERPRETATION

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, on behalf of the Zionist Executive, assured the British government (June 18, 1922) that the activities of the Zionist Organization would be conducted in conformity with the policy declared by the Colonial Office. The Zionist Executive took note of the fact that the volume of Jewish immigration was to be determined by the economic capacity of the country to absorb new arrivals. It confidently trusted that the British authorities would be guided by this principle.<sup>33</sup>

32. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Correspondence with the Palestine-Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organization, 1922*, p. 18-19.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

The Arab delegation, however, refused to endorse the Jewish national home policy, even in its more precise definition. It asserted that the outward signs of a "national" existence referred to in the British statement with respect to the Jewish community were also possessed by the other communities in Palestine; they maintained that if these were to constitute a reason why the Jews outside Palestine should be allowed to come into the country "as of right and not on sufferance," it was the more reason why the Arabs themselves should be confirmed in their national home as against all intruders, and immigration placed in their control. The Jews already in Palestine were there by right, and should enjoy the same status as the Arabs. But to argue that the right of the present Jewish community in Palestine should be extended to all the Jews of the world, as the British memorandum appeared to do, was to adopt a line of reasoning "which no people, let alone Arabs, would accept if applied to itself."<sup>34</sup>

Zionists looked upon the arguments of the Arab representatives with a certain degree of skepticism. They believed the great majority of uneducated Arabs in Palestine to be of simple mind, free from political knowledge or ambitions of any sort. It was their thesis that Arab landowners and employers who saw their influence being diminished and their profits cut into by reason of the higher wages paid to labor by Jews, made use of a relatively small group of educated youths to create an artificial agitation among the *fellahin* (agricultural laborers) with a view to injuring their Jewish rivals. They believed that if the masses of Arab workmen could be trained to expect higher wages and adopt a higher standard of living, the political agitation carried on by Arab employers would fail to receive in future the response it commanded at the moment.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

## THE ECONOMIC CONFLICT

Conflicts of an economic character have been represented by Arabs as having resulted from British willingness to forward the aims of Zionism. Arabs have complained that the administration has permitted a far greater immigration than the country was prepared to receive. They have asserted that economic disturbances from which the country has suffered could have been avoided or at least very greatly diminished if the British government had not included in the mandate a promise to facilitate Jewish immigration—modified though that promise was by a clause insuring the rights and position of other sections of the population. Zionists, on the contrary, have maintained that Jewish immigration was not excessive and that Jewish immigrants could have been absorbed

without distress either to themselves or to others had the Palestine administration carried out the British undertaking to make available for intensive Jewish colonization the tracts of State land and waste land referred to in Article 6 of the mandate.

Whatever view is taken of the immigration policy of the Palestine administration, the practical result it has achieved is a considerable increase in the population of the country. When the first Palestine census was taken in 1922 the population was found to be 757,182. In 1928 it was estimated to be 897,516<sup>35</sup>—an increase of 140,334. Part of this was a natural increase, but much more of it was due to immigration. Immigration and emigration since the year of the census are represented in the following table:<sup>36</sup>

## MOVEMENTS OF POPULATION

Year	IMMIGRATION			EMIGRATION			REFUSED ENTRY†	
	Total	Jews	Non-Jews	Total	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews and Non-Jews	
1922* .....	8,128	7,844	284	2,939	1,503	1,436	?	
1923 .....	7,991	7,421	570	4,947	3,466	1,481	218	
1924 .....	13,553	12,856	697	3,141	2,037	1,104†	?	
1925 .....	34,641	33,801	840	4,100	2,151	1,949	?	
1926 .....	13,910	13,081	829	9,429	7,365	2,064	300	
1927 .....	3,595	2,713	882	6,978	5,071	1,907	323	
1928 .....	3,086	2,178	908	2,822	2,168	954	313	

\*In the three years 1919-1921 some 20,000 immigrants entered the country. No reliable emigration figures are available for this early period.

†This figure is for six months only. Returns incomplete.

‡From annual reports of High Commissioner.

It will be seen from the above figures that Jewish immigration was almost doubled between the years 1923 and 1924, and that the figure for 1925 was almost three times as great as the figure for 1924. This very rapid increase was suddenly interrupted with the appearance of economic depression in 1925. In the following year immigration fell almost to the 1924 figure, while in 1927 and 1928 its volume was lower than at any time since the establishment of the British civil administration. There was at the same time a sharp increase in emigration. In 1927 emigration was almost twice as great as immigration, while in 1928 the movements to and from Palestine practically balanced each other. Arab emigration varied relatively little.<sup>37</sup>

The violent fluctuation in Jewish emigration is represented in the following table:<sup>38</sup>

## JEWISH EMIGRATION RATES

Year	Percentage compared with immigration
1922 .....	19
1923 .....	47
1924 .....	16
1925 .....	6
1926 .....	57
1927 .....	180
1928* .....	99

\*Of those who left the country in this year, 60 per cent had come to Palestine since the end of 1924. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan, 1928*, p. 91.

37. Before 1908 there was little Arab emigration from Palestine. But the restlessness created by the repressive policy of the Young Turks after 1908 encouraged Arab emigration, which has remained a feature of the mandatory régime also.

38. Based on figures given in the *Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission*, p. 45.

35. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan, 1928*, p. 55.

36. Based on the *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 191.

Many influences combined to bring about the marked fluctuation in Jewish immigration. Its volume depended in part upon the situation of Jews in the countries of their dispersion;<sup>39</sup> in part it depended upon the contributions to Zionist funds; in part it depended upon the immigration regulations of the British authorities in Palestine. These regulations varied. After trying other experiments which proved unsatisfactory, the Palestine administration decided in 1922 to control the immigration of laborers (who presented the chief problem) on the basis of semi-annual estimates of the country's requirements. By so-called "labor schedules," based on such estimates, it fixed the quota of laborers to be admitted after consultation with the Palestine Zionist Executive. The Zionist Organization was invited to fill practically the whole quota.<sup>40</sup> Continued economic depression, however, caused the labor quota to be reduced to the vanishing point. In a decree of August 1927 immigration was finally restricted to two classes of people—(a) the wives and infant children of actual residents of the country, and (b) persons in possession of a minimum of £1,000. Protests from the Zionist Executive failed either to secure a reduction in the minimum capital required of immigrants or to gain permission for agricultural laborers to enter the country.<sup>41</sup> Immigration certificates under the labor schedules were issued again in October 1928 and April 1929, however, the Zionist Organization receiving 600 such certificates on the first date and 2,400 on the second.

Official figures and estimates showed that although Palestine's future depended largely upon agricultural development, the majority of Jewish immigrants were settling in the towns. In 1922 there were found to be 68,000 Jews in urban areas and only 15,000 in rural areas. In 1925 government estimates placed the figures at 85,000 and 23,000

respectively, while Zionists estimated that 114,000 were in towns and 24,000 in the country.<sup>42</sup>

The Permanent Mandates Commission expressed concern in its report to the League Council in 1924, both because immigration had not always been in proportion to Palestine's capacity of economic absorption and because immigrants had not been allocated carefully enough with regard to the agricultural, commercial and industrial needs of the country.<sup>43</sup> The comments of the Mandates Commission did not have the desired effect, however; in the following year immigration figures were much larger than they had ever been before, and unemployment figures went up at an alarming rate. Arabs asked, without success, that a League commission be sent to Palestine to investigate conditions and assess the blame for the dislocation of the country's economic life.

#### IMMIGRATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

It was upon the Jewish community that the burden of unemployment chiefly fell. Jewish capital was immobilized by investments in land and extensive building operations as well as by investments in speculative purchases. Toward the end of 1925 there occurred a shortage of capital and restrictions of credit.<sup>44</sup> A sudden decline in building activity followed, together with general trade and financial depression. Figures of unemployment among Jewish workers in Palestine went up. During the summer months of 1924 and 1925 the monthly average of Jewish unemployed was in the neighborhood of 500. In the summer of 1926 it was 6,000. In 1927 it was still high, although by June 1928 it was reduced to less than 1,500. It was officially estimated in 1927 that the number of Jewish working men and women was 26,500. The above figures thus represented a high percentage of unemployment.

The general depression had an adverse effect upon non-Jewish workers also. The proportion of unemployment among Jews was much higher than among Arabs, but the

39. Of Jewish immigrants in 1928, 239 came from the British Empire, 250 from the United States, 1,110 from Northern Africa and Western Asia and 1,457 from Europe. (*Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan, 1928*, p. 92.) In general it may be said that the highest percentage came from Poland (an average of 38 per cent between 1922 and 1927) with Russia coming second (an average of 16 per cent in the same period). The percentage from America rose from 0.7 in 1922 to 9.3 in 1927. Cf. *Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission*, p. 46.

40. For a fuller account cf. L. Stein, "The Development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine," in A. J. Toynbee, *Survey of International Affairs, 1925*, Vol. I, p. 370 ff.

41. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 9.

42. L. Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 377.

43. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifth Session, 1924*, p. 189.

44. K. W. Stead, *Report on the Economic and Financial Situation of Palestine, 1927*, p. 10.

entire population of Palestine suffered from the existing financial stringency, while curtailment of appropriations for various public services delayed their normal development through the entire country.

As measures of relief, primarily for the Jewish unemployed, the Palestine government made appropriations for certain roads and other public works at an aggregate cost of a little over \$1,000,000<sup>45</sup> during 1926, 1927 and 1928. Although a certain number of Arab workmen were also employed on these projects, Arabs complained because the lack of a representative legislature made it impossible for them either to have a hand in controlling immigration or to decide in what manner and for what purposes public reve-

nues should be expended.

The Zionist Organization, unable to provide employment for all Jews who remained out of work in 1926 and 1927, had to resort to doles in the chief centers of Jewish population. In this way it prevented Jews from becoming a direct charge upon the public funds.<sup>46</sup> Successful attempts to substitute employment for the dole were put into effect in 1927, and in April 1928 the dole was stopped in the all-Jewish town of Tel Aviv, where it had continued longest. During 1927 the Zionist Organization distributed an average of \$34,000 monthly in unemployment relief.<sup>47</sup> Its special undertakings to provide work for the unemployed in 1927 and 1928 involved an expenditure of \$572,000.<sup>48</sup>

### COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION

While the people of Palestine were carrying the heavy burdens caused by the prevailing economic depression, a large surplus was accumulating in the Palestine treasury. By 1927 the surplus amounted to \$7,772,000<sup>49</sup>—a sum equivalent to three-quarters of the annual Palestine budget. By a prompt and judicious investment of a substantial part of this money in productive enterprises, Arabs and Jews believed the Palestine government would go far toward assuring the future prosperity of Palestine. In 1928, however, about \$3,000,000 of this surplus was turned over in settlement of Palestine's share of the Ottoman Public Debt to the satisfaction of foreign bondholders. About \$1,000,000 was also paid back into the British treasury, in consideration of the deficit incurred by the latter during the period of the military administration in Palestine.<sup>50</sup> This policy was characterized as short-sighted.

Zionists thought it indicated a willingness on the part of the Palestine authorities to place the chief responsibility for Palestine's economic development upon the Zionist Organization, while insuring that British and foreign interests should not suffer.

The British authorities, meanwhile, contented themselves with a slower development program than Zionist leaders suggested, being confident that a distinct advance in prosperity would come with the carrying out of three extensive projects for which concessions had been granted by 1929—*viz.*, construction of a modern harbor at Haifa, exploitation of Dead Sea salts, and the Rutenberg scheme for supplying the greater part of the country with electric light and power.

Palestine was struggling all the while with an adverse trade balance which showed no sign of reduction. Visible imports in 1928 totalled \$33,500,000, and visible exports only \$9,000,000, leaving an adverse balance of \$24,500,000.<sup>51</sup> These figures represented approximately what had been going on for seven years. The gravest feature of the trade situation was the fact that Palestine was still importing foodstuffs, such as cereals and olive oil, which it had exported before 1914 and ought still to have been exporting.

45. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan*, 1926, p. 60; 1927, p. 94; 1928, p. 82.

46. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan*, 1928, p. 116.

47. *Ibid.*, 1927, p. 96.

48. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 193, ff. A survey of Jewish industry in Palestine in 1926 had shown an investment of almost \$9,250,000 in general industrial undertakings, employing some 6,000 workmen (among whom were Arabs as well as Jews) and divided among the following categories in the order of their importance: foodstuffs, building materials, textiles, paper, wood, chemical industry, metal industry, leather and miscellaneous. Within these categories several types of industry were established which had not formerly existed in Palestine (*Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission*, 1928, p. 72).

49. *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan*, 1927, p. 7.

50. *Ibid.*, 1928, p. 8.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 29.



## LAND POLICY

Zionists maintained that what the country needed was a vigorous program of agricultural development—something more far-reaching than the \$2,800,000 worth of short-term loans to cultivators issued in 1920-1925, and something more rapid than the afforestation, drainage and irrigation projects already entered upon. Jewish immigrants from Central Europe—many of them enthusiastic exponents of a back-to-the-land movement—found when they reached Palestine that the opportunities in agricultural districts were not what they had expected. Their leaders blamed the Palestine administration for retarding the work of agricultural reconstruction by failing to provide Jewish organizations with large tracts of State land and waste land for close settlement as provided in the mandate. A concession for reclaiming the Kabbarah swamps between Jaffa and Haifa was given to the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association in 1921; but in the Beisan area near the Jordan River, in which Zionists had expected to receive a concession, prior claims were found to have been established by Arabs. Accordingly, Jewish expectations of close settlement in this area could not be immediately fulfilled. The government did make provision, however, on the urgent representations of the Jewish Agency, that lands sold by Arab owners in the Beisan area should go by preference to *bona fide* settlers, rather than to speculators.

In 1925 the Zionist Organization complained to the Permanent Mandates Commission that Article 6 of the mandate, in so far as it related to assistance in land settlement, still remained substantially inoperative, although the mandate itself had been in force for a considerable time.<sup>52</sup> The British authorities explained that most of the State lands in Palestine were already occupied by non-Jewish tenants, who had certain moral, if not legal claims to such lands and who could not be dispossessed without infringing the provisions of the mandate. Again, isolated properties were of little value for Jewish settlement; but

there were few State properties of really adequate size, so that the government was doubly hampered in fulfilling the wishes of the Zionist settlers.

Under these circumstances a considerable amount of land had to be bought privately by Jewish immigrants and the process of agricultural development was proportionately retarded. Prices charged by Arab owners of the land were usually two or three times their pre-war value,<sup>53</sup> and sometimes soared even higher.

Under the British administration no land has passed from Arab to Jewish possession except what has been voluntarily sold by Arabs. Resentment nevertheless exists among Arabs at the spectacle of Jewish penetration into what were formerly purely Arab communities. Some former landowners, who found considerable difficulty in marketing produce in the early post-war period decided to sell out; many of them now regret their decision.

By 1927 there were in Palestine 104 agricultural settlements, of which fifty were Zionist colonies and fifty-four colonies of the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association. Land held by Jews in the whole country totalled 1,000,200 *dunums* (about a quarter of a million acres)<sup>54</sup> and equalled about one-fourteenth of the total exploitable area of Palestine. Of this area 463,000 *dunums*, or not quite half, was under operation by farmers in 1927, while a still smaller area, about 37.2 per cent, was under actual cultivation.<sup>55</sup>

Overhead expenditures were high in many of the Jewish settlements because of the necessity for irrigating or draining most of the land. By 1929 only eight of the Zionist agricultural settlements were considered self-supporting<sup>56</sup> although the colonies of the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association were in a considerably stronger position.

53. Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925, p. 32.

54. Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission, 1928, p. 49. Of this land 42.8 per cent was in the hands of the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association, 22.5 per cent was in private hands, 21.3 per cent belonged to the Jewish National Fund, while 13.4 per cent belonged to the American Zion Commonwealth and affiliated companies. The American Zion Commonwealth (an American corporation organized for the purchase of land in Palestine) later sold most of its holdings to the Jewish National Fund (Zionist Executive Report, 1929, p. 256).

55. Ibid., p. 255.

56. Ibid., p. 210.

52. Permanent Mandates Commission, Minutes of the Seventh Session, 1925, p. 184.

## FISCAL POLICY

Zionists deplored the fact that the chief burden of direct and indirect taxation fell upon the agricultural population of Palestine. The tithe levied on agricultural produce was particularly vexatious—even in its altered form under the commutation of tithes ordinance—inasmuch as it put a premium on the non-cultivation of land. Zionists also maintained that some concession in respect of taxation should be made to new agricultural settlements in their early stages, as was done by other governments wishing to encourage agricultural colonization.<sup>57</sup>

The Palestine administration did not intend to make any material change in the system of agricultural taxation until land surveys were completed and local boundary disputes settled. Zionists, however, believed that the work of surveying the land could be considerably accelerated, and that in the meantime other steps should be taken to redistribute the burden of taxation.

## EDUCATION

Jews complained not only that the authorities were placing unnecessary burdens upon their agricultural settlements, but also that the Jewish community was being forced to bear a disproportionate responsibility for raising the general standard of living and of civilization in Palestine. Especially in the spheres of education and public health did they believe this to be the case.

Toward the maintenance of Jewish schools the Palestine government gave a subsidy of about \$14,500 in 1925 and 1926—or about three per cent of its general educational budget. Zionists protested—since government schools were attended almost exclusively by Arab children—at having to pay taxes for the upkeep of government schools, unless a larger share of such taxes were to be returned to the Jews in the form of subsidies for their own schools.<sup>58</sup> Under the present system Zionists asserted that the Jewish community was carrying a large share of

the government's own responsibility with respect to education.

It is to be noted, however, that the level of education among the children of Palestinian Arabs has been relatively low. In 1928 the number of pupils in government schools was 21,259. The number of pupils in Jewish schools was hardly 2,000 less. Yet the settled Arab population was five times as great as the Jewish population, and its school population should have been at least five times as great. In 1928, in spite of the Arab educational problem, the central government raised its subsidy to Jewish schools to \$97,000, which was acknowledged by the Zionist Executive to be "approximately the full share due . . . in proportion to the number of Jews in Palestine."<sup>59</sup>

## PUBLIC HEALTH

The condition of public health in Palestine made it imperative for the Zionist Organization to undertake for the protection of the Jewish community the wide health activities already described (see p. 280). Jewish health services were both directly and indirectly advantageous to the Arab population. Yet for a number of years the British authorities gave practically no aid to the Jewish health services, but expended public funds instead on institutions patronized largely by Arabs.<sup>60</sup> Here, as in the case of education, repeated requests for increased recognition of Jewish health work finally won a certain response. In 1928 the Palestine government gave a grant of \$38,800 toward the *Hadassah* hospital in Tel Aviv and raised the standard of general medical inspection.<sup>61</sup> In this case, as in education, it appeared to be the policy of the government, however, to expend as large a proportion of its revenue as possible on the Arab majority which stood in greatest need of assistance.

## PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY

A more bitter cause of Jewish complaint has been the lack of protection for Jewish

57. *Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission*, p. 65-66.

58. *Permanent Mandates Commission, Minutes of the Ninth Session, 1926*, p. 208.

59. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 15.

60. *Permanent Mandates Commission, Minutes of the Ninth Session, 1926*, p. 209.

61. *Zionist Executive Report, 1929*, p. 13.

life and property in the face of the latent hostility of the Arab majority. At the time of the disturbances in 1920 and 1921 the Palestine administration did a little to meet Jewish demands for increased protection. It issued rifles to certain Jewish villages which could not be reached immediately in case of sudden attack;<sup>62</sup> but this had not been considered enough. To provide against possible contingencies certain other Jewish groups smuggled arms into the country.<sup>63</sup> Arabs believed a rumor that the government was arming Jews secretly and themselves clamored for arms.<sup>64</sup> When tension eventually eased the British government withdrew the British and Indian infantry, cavalry and artillery units maintained in Palestine since the war. There remained in 1925 only one battalion of 450 British gendarmes, a regiment of cavalry, one squadron of airplanes and one company of armored cars.<sup>65</sup> There was, in addition, a native police force.

Later the gendarmerie was disbanded, the police force was augmented, and a Transjordan Frontier Force was created, only a

small part of whose personnel was used in Palestine itself along the border between Palestine and Transjordan. Jews viewed with concern the tendency to keep Jewish members of the police force down to a proportion strictly in keeping with the size of the Jewish population of Palestine. With practically no British troops in the country, they were uneasy over the possibility of attacks with which the Jewish police would be unable to cope. In the Palestine Police Force in 1928, out of a total of 2,143 (all ranks), only 321 were Jews, while 1,293 were Moslem and 471 Christian Arabs. Again, twenty-six members of the Transjordan Frontier Force were Jewish, while 89 were Christian and 340 Moslem.

Under Lord Plumer's administration<sup>66</sup> no serious outbreaks occurred and the question of Jewish defense did not become acute. But with the attacks and bloodshed which occurred under the administration of Sir John Chancellor, the demand for adequate protection of Jewish life and property became more vigorous than ever before.

## THE RELIGIOUS CONFLICT

A final conflict between Jews and Arabs in Palestine centred about Jewish and Moslem holy places in Jerusalem, whose juxtaposition had been a source of difficulty even before the British mandate was established.

What is believed to be a remnant of Solomon's Temple is today incorporated in one of the walls of an enclosure within which stands a Moslem shrine—the Dome of the Rock—sacred because it is reputed to be the spot visited by the Prophet Mohammed during a miraculous visit to Jerusalem. Although the so-called Wailing Wall and a considerable area around it have for centuries been Moslem (Wakf) property,<sup>67</sup>

Jews were permitted under the Turkish régime to perform their devotions before it. The Turkish authorities, however, did not wish the Jews to acquire any prescriptive right to the area. Thus they objected when Jews introduced benches or chairs for the use of worshippers and are said to have ruled in 1912 that no screens should be brought to the pavement.<sup>68</sup>

Under the British régime in Palestine, Moslems have been particularly watchful to see that there shall be no diminution of Moslem property rights with respect to this area and have not been willing to rely passively on the guarantees for the integrity of Moslem shrines contained in Article 13 of the mandate.

## THE YOM KIPPUR INCIDENT, 1928

On September 24, 1928 the insistence of Arabs in this respect led to an incident which greatly roused Jewish communities throughout Palestine and abroad. During

62. The rifles were under lock and key and entrusted to responsible persons.

63. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifth Session, 1924*, p. 98.

64. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the Commission of Inquiry*, October 1921, p. 53.

65. Great Britain. Colonial Office, *Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920-1925*, p. 5.

66. 1925-1928.

67. Wakf property consists largely of pious bequests administered by Moslem authorities in accordance with the terms of the former owner's will. In some cases rents from Wakf property are used entirely for the upkeep of religious foundations; in others they are divided with the descendants of the former owner of the property.

68. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fourteenth Session, 1928*, p. 251.

the most solemn part of the ritual at the Wailing Wall on the Jewish Day of Atonement, police broke through the crowd on the instructions of a British official and forcibly removed a temporary screen erected to separate the sexes in accordance with an orthodox Jewish custom, discontinued during the Turkish régime owing to official opposition. The sudden disturbance created a painful impression, not only upon the worshippers but upon the Jewish community in general. Although the police had notified the beadle in charge on the day before the incident that the screen would have to be removed, and although the beadle had failed to carry out his promise to remove it, Jewish authorities held that aggressive action at such a place and on such a day was inexcusable, especially since the British district authorities had given no previous notification to any responsible Jewish authority that the screen would not be permitted to remain. The Palestine administration issued a communiqué stating that the removal of the screen had been necessary, because in cases involving infractions of the *status quo* immediate action was imperative. It did, however, state that it regretted "all the circumstances attending that removal."<sup>69</sup>

Under Article 13 of the mandate, as already seen, the British authorities are responsible for "preserving existing rights" in connection with the holy places. They must first determine and then maintain the *status quo*. Moslems have long been suspicious of the Jews, charging constant encroachments at the Wailing Wall. The Jews, on the other hand, have attempted to convince the High Commissioner that thirty or forty years ago they were allowed to bring benches to the wall. Moslems admitted that this might have been done during periods when the Wailing Wall was not attracting public notice. But they produced documentary evidence to show that the practice had actually been prohibited by the Turks; the Jews hitherto have produced no documentary evidence of formal permission from the Turks to utilize benches at the Wailing Wall.<sup>70</sup>

69. Permanent Mandates Commission. *Minutes of the Fourteenth Session, 1928*, p. 253; Great Britain. Colonial Office, *The Western or Wailing Wall in Jerusalem*, Cmd. 3229.

70. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifteenth Session, 1929*, p. 94.

## SUBSEQUENT AGITATION

Further offense to Jews grew out of the fact that an official permit was granted the Moslems in 1928 to conduct building operations on that part of their property which is within the enclosure beyond the Wailing Wall. Jews protested against the alterations, being of the opinion that they constituted an infringement of the *status quo*. The alterations consisted of the erection of (1) a building which rose above the wall within the enclosure, and commanded a view of Jewish worshippers outside the wall, and (2) a doorway cut in a further section of the wall surrounding the mosque enclosure, whereby Moslems emerging from the Mosques of Omar or El Aksa might readily reach the Wailing Wall itself.

Seeing before him nothing but a long series of disputes unless some decisive action was taken in the matter, the High Commissioner, Sir John Chancellor, approached both parties in 1928 with the suggestion that the Wailing Wall area be sold to the Jews. The latter welcomed the suggestion, but it was not accepted by the Moslem leaders. Fear lest the 1924 expropriation ordinance might be applied to the Wailing Wall led Arab nationalists to bring the subject to the attention of the League Council in December 1928. The British government, however, assured the Secretary-General of the League in a letter dated June 8, 1929 that in view of the provisions of Article 13 of the Palestine mandate there could be no question of the compulsory expropriation of any holy place.<sup>71</sup>

## THE 1929 OUTBREAK

Both Jewish and Arab communities in Palestine found in the Wailing Wall issue a symbol of their hitherto unreconciled ambitions with respect to the future of Palestine itself. Interest in the Wailing Wall question spread far beyond the borders of Palestine among both Moslem and Jewish communities. It no longer represented a purely religious issue; it now stood for po-

71. Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Fifteenth Session, 1929*, p. 253.



litical and religious issues as well. In both Jewish and Moslem communities, that is to say, individuals who were not usually concerned about the welfare of either shrine now became intensely interested in their fate because of the agitation carried on with respect to the matter.

In face of the growing tension, the High Commissioner asked both Moslem and Jewish leaders for guarantees of moderation in press discussions of the subject.<sup>72</sup> Matters came to a head in mid-August, however, during the absence from Palestine not only of the High Commissioner, but also of the members of the Palestine Zionist Executive, who had gone to Switzerland for the Zionist Congress and the subsequent meeting of the Council of the Jewish Agency. It so happened that the Jewish day of lamentation for the destruction of the temple fell on August 15 this year and that the following day, August 16, was the eve of the Prophet Mohammed's birthday. These two religious anniversaries brought to Jerusalem great numbers both of Jews and Moslems as in previous years. But this year, owing to the heated discussions of the Wailing Wall question which had taken place during

the preceding eleven months, a spirit of hostility was abroad.

Moreover, the knowledge that Zionists had just succeeded in winning the support of non-Zionists for the work of the Jewish Agency led Arabs to feel that a new vigor had been imparted to the Jewish national home experiment, and that in consequence new intensity would characterize the Arab-Jewish conflict in future. When tens of thousands of Jews and Moslems converged upon the same small locality in Jerusalem within twenty-four hours of each other, rioting occurred, mutual hostility increased, and a week later there came the violent attacks throughout the country, involving in some cases the lives of non-combatants, which had to be met by the intervention of British military forces.

One of the consequences of the recent disorders has been a stiffening of the attitude of both Jews and Arabs with respect to the demands each group has been making of the British authorities. The discussions which will soon take place will thus be concerned not primarily with the Wailing Wall issue, which merely precipitated the disturbances, but with the more fundamental causes of conflict in Palestine.

## CONCLUSION

The religious, economic and political conflicts briefly reviewed in the foregoing pages indicate only some of the difficulties which have arisen out of the modern experiment of creating in Palestine a national home for the Jews. There are many others. At the heart of all of them are the opposing forces of two distinct nationalisms. To the Jews Palestine is still *Eretz Israel*, the "land of Israel." The Arabic-speaking inhabitants, to whom it is known as *Falastin* (Philistia), resent the implication of the Hebrew phrase used in official Jewish documents. They do not acquiesce in the doctrine that a country which they are accustomed to think of as being their own should suddenly be called *Eretz Israel* without their consent, simply because it has pleased other nations to set up in it a Jewish national home. Jews and Arabs both entered Palestine by right of conquest and to that extent Arabs are will-

ing to acknowledge that claims of Jews to the country were formerly as valid as their own are now. But the Arabs point out that their own possession of the country since the seventh century gives them rights to-day which the Jews scattered abroad do not possess. These time-honored rights, they believe, although given partial recognition in Article 22 of the League Covenant, have been disregarded and infringed upon by the post-war settlement in the Near East.

If Arabs claim the right of self-determination in Palestine on the ground of their present possession of the country, Jews put forward claims to special rights on the basis of the clear commitments of various nations to support the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The long history of Jewish persecution in Europe has strengthened the traditional desire of the Jews for a return to the early home of the race. It has also done much to win for

72. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

their project the support of governments which might have been indifferent to their ambitions had the position of Jews in Europe been more secure. With the backing of the League of Nations, therefore, and with the definite commitments of Great Britain and the United States giving them considerable practical encouragement, Zionists feel that their claims are internationally established beyond the shadow of a doubt. Arabs retort that Great Britain's commitments to themselves, although they may have conflicted with the Balfour declaration were equally clear and ought to have been fulfilled. The reply of the Jews is an appeal to fact; Great Britain has decided to stand by the Balfour declaration. Arab expectations, if they were justified at all by British undertakings, have received the practical support neither of the British government nor of other nations, in contrast to the Balfour declaration which has received such support. The Arabs, they are inclined to think, must accommodate themselves to a *fait accompli*.

Politically informed Arabs have often maintained the thesis that injustice has been done to Palestine by the League of Nations; that advantage has been taken of the temporary helplessness of the country to foist upon it a distasteful experiment; that in spite of the fact that Palestine is grouped with the other Class A mandates, the League of Nations has allowed the mandatory power to maintain a colonial form of government in the country for the sole purpose of carrying out the aforesaid experiment; that a powerful international organization has been allowed to promote the interests of the Jews in Palestine regardless of Arab interests, while Arabs are being deprived of the right to establish representative government until such time as the Jewish minority shall have increased its numbers sufficiently to be able to carry out Jewish policies in any legislature which may subsequently be formed; that in this sense the mandatory power has been administering the country on behalf of an absent and merely potential population rather than on behalf of its present and actual population. The division and subdivision of the Arabic-speaking territories of the Near East have retarded their economic recovery. The post-war

settlement, they believe, is based on injustice and calls for radical alteration.

To Jews the question has become one of financing and protecting the work of Jewish settlement in Palestine. The chief financial burden falls on the Jews of the United States; the military responsibility devolves chiefly upon Great Britain. It is the aim of Zionism to reduce this double burden as rapidly as possible—to place Jewish settlements on a self-supporting basis on the one hand and on the other to obviate the necessity for strong military protection by demonstrating to the Arabs the economic and other gains which may be expected to come to them as the result of the Jewish influx. Already, they believe, Arabs have begun to realize that their best interests are bound up with the rapid development of the country which Zionists are trying to effect; that the raising of the standard of living will transform life for the ordinary agricultural workers, or *fellahin*, and that improved sanitation and medical service will eliminate a great deal of the present waste of human life among the Arabs.

Great Britain's assumption of responsibility in Palestine and its support of the Jewish national home project are partly matters of prestige, and partly motivated by a desire for economic advantage. More important than either of these considerations, however, is the necessity, from the British viewpoint, of controlling the most direct lines of communication with India and the East. The Palestine-Transjordan-Iraq route is one which Great Britain has long desired to control. The Balfour declaration was based on many considerations; but one of the chief of them was the belief that a friendly Jewish population in Palestine would be one of the best possible guarantees of continued British control in Palestine, which at once flanks the Suez Canal and guards the approach to the more direct route to India. Apparently it is Great Britain's intention to continue its attempt to find some means of reconciling diverse interests in Palestine. A declaration of policy is to be expected shortly, when the causes for the recent outbreaks have been determined. With this declaration of policy another phase of Palestine's post-war development will presumably be reached.